



CITY OF BURBANK
Park, Recreation and Community Services Department
STAFF REPORT

DATE: September 30, 2014

TO: Mark Scott, City Manager

FROM: Judie Wilke, Park, Recreation and Community Services Director

SUBJECT: FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING AN OFF-LEASH DOG PARK AT THE STARLIGHT BOWL LOWER PARKING LOT

RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to the Park, Recreation and Community Services (PRCS) Board's (Board) recommendation at the August 14, 2014 meeting, staff seeks City Council direction whether or not to move forward in evaluating cost and operation of an off-leash dog park at the Starlight Bowl Lower Parking Lot (SBLPL).

BACKGROUND

The development of an off-leash dog park has been discussed on and off since 1997. Since then, staff has been working with the City Council and the Board in assessing the feasibility of developing an off-leash dog park. Throughout the course of discussions, eleven potential sites have been identified (Exhibit A).

More recently, the Board toured and discussed the following sites:

- Starlight Bowl - Employee Parking Lot (Last parking lot on the left side and near the driveway leading up to the Starlight Bowl) and the Lower Parking Lot (lot is located on the corner of Walnut and Lockheed Drive);
- Whitnall Highway Easement South (Located on the corner of Verdugo Avenue and Avon Street); and
- Johnny Carson Park (South side of the 134, and north and south of Riverside Drive).

Subsequently, at the August 14, 2014 Board meeting, the aforementioned sites were discussed and the Board recommended that the City Council consider developing an off-leash dog park at the SBLPL site. In alignment with the Board's recommendation, staff is requesting that the City Council provide staff with further direction on their support of the project and proposed location. Should City Council agree with the Board's recommendation, further direction should be provided on how to proceed with the development of a potential dog park prior to allocating additional staff time, resources, and funds to the potential project.

DISCUSSION

The Board and PRCS staff identified that every site has its challenges (Exhibit B). However, the Board believes that the SBLPL is the most optimal site as it would have the least impact to the community. To that end, staff believed it would be beneficial to provide the City Council with pros and cons that were discussed with the Board regarding the SBLPL.

PROS

- Existing City-owned property.
- Underutilized existing open space.
- Can be accessed from two locations.
- Enough property to develop large and small dog park area and dedicated parking.
- Remote site away from residential area.
- Close proximity to the Stough Canyon Park restroom facility.
- Potential opportunity to develop walking, hiking, and/or running trails.

CONS

- Ingress/egress would impact same neighborhood affected by Castaway, DeBell, Starlight Bowl and Nature Center traffic.
- Surrounding wildlife and potential interaction with community members and dogs.
- Existing and potential future expansion of programming at the Starlight Bowl Amphitheatre.
- No existing irrigation but has potential for irrigation.
- Potential impacts to other City uses such as Burbank Water and Power and Public Works.
- Used for filming parking. (However, parking could be shifted to still accommodate the use).
- Dog noise could impact the DeBell Golf Course clientele.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- The City has existing agreements with the Burbank Unified School District (BUSD) and The Castaway (Castaway) for utilization of the site.
- The BUSD utilizes this site for graduation parking.
- The Castaway utilizes this space for overflow event parking. (However, overflow parking could be shifted to another Starlight Bowl Parking Lot in close proximity which would not impact the Castaway's parking operations).

While it is important to consider development costs associated with the project, these costs are unknown because a location and specific design elements for the project have not been solidified. However, staff anticipates that the development costs for a dog park could range from \$100,000 to \$700,000 depending on the size of the facility and the amenities selected. To that end, staff believes that a portion of the development costs could be offset through grant opportunities, and private and non-profit sponsorships/partnerships. However, it is important to note that funding has not been allocated towards the development of and ongoing maintenance needs of the project.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact is unknown at this time because a specific design element for the project has not been solidified. Currently, there are no funds allocated towards the development or ongoing maintenance needs. Due to the scope and size of this project, it would be included as a capital project in the upcoming budget process for City Council consideration.

CONCLUSION

Over the years, the City Council and PRCS Board have studied the feasibility of developing an off-leash dog park. However, prior to directing staff to develop an off-leash dog park, the Board wanted to ensure the City Council was in agreement with the project and site selection. If the City Council decides that this is a project worth pursuing, staff will include it as a capital project in the upcoming budget process.

EXHIBITS

- A – Potential Dog Park Sites
- B – Dog Park Site Challenges

POTENTIAL DOG PARK SITES



1. Brace Canyon Park (City-Owned Property)
2. Bel Aire Park (City-Owned Property)
3. Johnny Carson Park North (City-Owned Property)
4. Johnny Carson Park South (LA Owned Property-leased to City)
5. Whitnall Highway Easement South (City-Owned Property)
6. Whitnall Highway Easement North (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Owned Property)
7. Palm Park (City-Owned Property)
8. Starlight Bowl Parking Lot at Stough Park (City-Owned Property)
9. Wood Lot Area (City-Owned Property)
10. Cabrini Basin (City-Owned Property)
11. Interstate 5- HOV Right of Way (City-Owned Property)
12. Lundigan Park (City-Owned Property)

● Directly Adjacent Dog Parks.

DOG PARK SITE CHALLENGES

POTENTIAL SITE	CHALLENGES
1) Brace Canyon Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Existing site would require grading to become suitable for use. • Area is adjacent to reservoir which could create water quality issues.
2) Bel Aire Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Limited street parking. • Currently utilized as an active ballfield facility. Redeveloping site would result in programming issues and a loss of revenue for the PRCS Department. • No permanent restroom facilities.
3) Johnny Carson Park North (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans to redevelop park are currently underway and scope of that project does not include such a facility. • Impact existing developed park acreage. • Adjacent to freeway invites non-resident usage. • Area relies on street parking. • Impacted by Media District traffic and surrounding uses.
4) Johnny Carson Park South (Los Angeles Owned Property- leased to the City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts existing developed park acreage. • Adjacent to freeway (dog safety). • Area relies on street parking. • Impacted by Media District traffic and surrounding uses. • Borders residential neighborhood. • Could impact adjacent equestrian trails. • Areas will be used as staging site for LADWP upper reach project.
5) Whitnall Highway Easement South (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • Limited street parking. • Impact existing parkland acreage. • No restroom facilities or irrigation system. • Close proximity to other dog parks outside of city boundaries (1.3 miles).
6) Whitnall Highway Easement North (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • LADWP easement land use issues. • No restroom facilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No irrigation system or water supply. • Limited street parking. • Close proximity to other dog parks outside of city boundaries (.35 miles).
7) Palm Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not viable because there is a reservoir. A dog park can't be built over a reservoir due to water quality issues. • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • No dedicated parking. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Currently utilized as an active ballfield facility. Redeveloping site would result in programming issues and a loss of revenue for PRCS Department. • No permanent restroom facilities.
8) Starlight Bowl Parking Lot at Stough Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact same neighborhood affected by Castaway, DeBell, Starlight Bowl and Nature Center traffic. • Upper portion of lot is over landfill and cannot be developed into an active park site due to ground settlement and regulatory issues. • No existing irrigation. • Would negatively impact programming at the Starlight Bowl.
9) Wood Lot Area (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact same neighborhood affected by Castaway, DeBell, Starlight Bowl and Nature Center traffic. • No restroom facilities. • No existing irrigation. • Currently, existing access is restricted. • Impacts to other City uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BWP and PW wood lot storage area might have to be relocated ○ Security issues for site because it's near BWP training facility.
10) Cabrini Basin (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhoods. • One access point on private property and located immediately across from residential neighborhood. • No existing water supply, irrigation, restroom facilities, or dedicated parking.
11) Interstate 5-HOV Right of Way (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to freeway (dog safety). • Land better suited for a developed property with a higher use – Economic Development.
12) Lundigan Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact existing parkland acreage (already very limited open space). • Located in residential area. • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • Limited street parking.